

Attorney's Docket No.: 06618-406001

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Each of the claims has been amended herein to recite that the catalyst ink includes an ionomer which has a property of improving ion conduction. This facilitates conduction of ions across the eventual fuel cell in which it is used.

The rejection "of record" referred to Serpico as defining an ionomer in column 3 lines 58-63. However, this cited portion described an "ionic polymer", did not specify it as being an ionomer, and certainly did not specify that material as having the property of improving ion conduction. Furthermore, new claims 23-26 have been added to define that the ionomer is Nafion configured as an ion conducting material. Therefore, each of the claims which now define this feature should be allowable for these reasons alone.

In addition, however, many of the claims have been additionally amended. The rejection reads the "another material" on carbon fibers. This has been obviated by amending claims seven to recite that the another material is ruthenium.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite that the another material is another catalytic material, which can certainly not be carbon fibers. Claims 18 and 20 have been similarly amended to define the another catalytic material.

Attorney's Docket No.: 06618-406001

Claim 9 has been amended to recite that the catalytic material comprises substantially 60% platinum and 40% ruthenium, thus further distinguishing over the cited prior art. The specification describes how 60/40 platinum to ruthenium provides optimum performance, see for example page 6 lines 23-25.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite preparing a substrate of carbon fiber paper by adding fluorocarbon polymer to the carbon fiber paper.

Claim 14 defines with the fluorocarbon polymer is added as 5 weight percent. This further distinguishes over the cited prior art. Claims 18 and 20 define used in a direct methanol fuel cell, which is not suggested by any of the cited prior art.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, therefore, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.


It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as

Attorney's Docket No.: 06618-406001

specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Enclosed is a
Enter \$ amount check for excess claim fees and a
Enter \$ amount check for the Petition for Extension of Time
fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit
Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/11/05

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10570012.doc